Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/917,058	MURRAY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
·	Brian E Pellegrino	3738
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Brian E Pellegrino</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Helen Lockhart</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 20 December 2004	Time:	·
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		•
Rejection(s) discussed: that of record, declaration of Dr. Micheli		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: that of record		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	IERAL NATURE OF WHAT W	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ 	The examiner will provide a wri e record of the substance of the	itten summary of the substance ne interview, since the interview
R CO.000 0=		
Buan Cfellegring (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	ant/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)
j '	• •	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was noted that the declaration arguments by Dr. Micheli point out that prior art compositions with the hemostatic protein in the rejection made are not used in arthroscopic surgeries. However, the claims did not recite that the method was done arthroscopicly. It was also noted that the prior art did not teach a composition within an intra-synovial environment that resists premature degradation of the replacement tissue material. Authorization was obtained from Ms. Lockhart for the Examiner's amendment.

TC 3700, AU 3738 Primary Examiner Brian E. Pellegrino

36P